



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

It would be ungrateful to close this notice without repeating an expression of satisfaction at the appearance of this admirable work. Its faults are so few and its virtues are so many that it can be safely recommended to the student. Continued use will undoubtedly bring out other mistakes and omissions, but it can hardly affect one's opinion of the admirable plan and the consistent attempt at thoroughness.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

---

Andreas Heusler : *Die lieder der lücke im Codex Regius der Edda* (Sonderabdruck aus "Germanistische Abhandlungen," Hermann Paul zum 17 März, 1902 dargebracht), Strassburg, Trübner.

Any one who has been engaged in the study of the old Eddic lays knows that the famous principal MS. in which they are found, *Codex Regius* 2365, 4<sup>to</sup>, in the old Royal collection in the Great Royal Library of Copenhagen is defective. There has, unfortunately, been lost a whole form of eight leaves; that this is the number that has been lost can be assumed with the greatest degree of probability, since the forms in the old Icelandic vellums in general consist of eight leaves. This is also the case with the preserved forms in *Codex Regius* except the last which has only five, clearly because the writer could calculate that he did not need more than that for the rest of the lays in the collection.

It is not a difficult matter to tell how many strophes there were on the eight leaves. According to the usual number given the second *Lay of Guðrún* to and including *Guðrúnorhöp*, which takes up c. 16 pages in the Codex (together with inconsiderable prose parts) contain about 260 strophes. Although this number is by no means exact (more exact would it be, for example, if the verses were counted), it is nevertheless probably not far from correct. Here account must, however, be taken of the fact that between the separate poems there may have been, and it is reasonable to suppose have been, larger or smaller prose parts, which would reduce the number of strophes accordingly. Much more than c. 250 ordinary strophes we are hardly justified in assuming to have been contained in the lacuna.

It is known beyond a doubt, that this part included (1) the end of the *Sigrdrífumál*, (2) the beginning (the first part, the two first thirds, or whatever the amount may have been) of the poem the end of which is found on the first leaf after the lacuna. It may be supposed that the contents corresponded to chapters 21 (the end : the end of *Sigrdr.*) to chapter 29 (30), in *Völsungasaga*, which both before and after are based on the poems of the Edda before and after the lacuna. This relation is important evidence. The question is now, how much of this (especially chapters 22-29 of the *saga*) rests on poems, how many and which were they.

It is this question that Professor A. Heusler has investigated with greater thoroughness and acuteness than anyone before him. The chapters of the *saga* mentioned contain the following : chapter 22 is a description of Sigurd Fáfnisbane which without the least doubt has been taken from the *Þiðrekssaga*. This chapter Heusler leaves entirely out of account, and accepts that it has been taken from *Þiðrekss.* (p. 3). Chapters 23-24 treat of Sigurd with Heime, where Brynhild is and where Sigurd accidentally sees her as he is pursuing his falcon who has lighted at Brynhild's tower-window. Chapters 25-29 treat of the Gjukungs and Sigurd's relation to them, of Gunnar and Brynhild approximately to where Brynhild induces Gunnar to kill Sigurd, and falsely accuses him of breach of faith with Gunnar (or to Str. 6, 12 ff. of *Sigurðarkv. sk.*). Chapter 25 relates Gudrun's dreams and a conversation between her and Brynhild, who interprets her dreams ; Chapter 26, Sigurd's coming to Gjuki and marriage with Gudrun ; Chapter 27 Gunnar's wooing of Brynhild, Sigurd's ride through the flame in Gunnar's form and finally their wedding ; Chapter 28 tells of a conversation between Gudrun and Brynhild, in which the latter learns of the deceit that has been practiced upon her : in these two chapters three strophes in *fornyrðislag* are given ; in Chapter 29 are described Brynhild's grief, Sigurd's conversation with her and her vehement appeal to Gunnar to kill Sigurd ; here also a verse is cited.

Professor Heusler accepts and attempts to establish, by an exhaustive analysis that this content (Chapters 23-29 and some passages in the following) rests on lost poems, that were in the lacuna. Of such he assumes four, namely : a falcon-poem (corresponding to Chapters 23-24) from the thirteenth century ; a lay relating the dreams (cor. to most of 25) of the same age : a longer Sigurd lay, a longer lay from the later classical heroic period (beginning of the twelfth century?) and finally the first half of a

Sigurd lay from the heathen period (*Sigurðarkviða en forna*). The last half of this poem is *Brot* of *Sigurðarkviðu* (cf. VII, brief summary). In section VI Heusler tries to characterize each of these lays, and to give their relation to one another; this would seem to be, and indeed is, a venturesome undertaking, something that the author is fully conscious of.

Some of the author's results are attended by serious objections. First of all as a general objection it is highly improbable that our collection should contain lays from the thirteenth century. The youngest of the lays, *Grípissþá* is generally accepted to belong to the twelfth century, and it has obviously been included in the collection later. In general I do not have much faith in a theory of Eddic poems after 1200. But the two assumed by Heusler to belong after 1200 certainly could have originated in the twelfth century (been contemporary with *Grípissþá*).

I do not believe that there ever existed a *Lay of the Falcon*, or that 23-24 go back to such a lay. In my *Litteraturhistorie* I have assumed that these two chapters the internal character of which is very different and that are closely connected with the late fiction of *Áslaug* as a daughter of *Brynhild* and *Sigurd*, is a loan from elsewhere, just like the preceding chapter (from *Þiðrekss.*), and it was not difficult to show whence it is borrowed, from the older saga of *Ragnar Loðbrok*; with this the contents agree admirably. I adhere to my former opinion with regard to this matter and cannot accept the author's statement when he says unreservedly that after *Sigrdrífumál* followed in the collection a passage, the contents of which we know from *Gríp.* 19, 27-31 and from *Vǫls.* Chapters 23-77; nor can I accept his remarks against me (p. 32), for it is a matter of course that there must be some internal connection between Chapters 27 and 43 (*Áslaug*), even though the author or later redactor does not express himself more fully. As I have already said, I cannot admit that the author has succeeded in establishing the existence of a *Lay of the Falcon*. To this I desire to add that it is not to be assumed beforehand that the author of *Helreið* knew *Heimir*, for it does not mention the latter's name, but only *Hymdalir*, *Brynhild*'s supposed home.

Then Heusler attempts (IV) to prove the existence of a lay relating the dreams, (the main part of Chapter 25). Here it seems to me we can more safely accept the author's position. Although it is not an easy matter to form a judgment of the prose chapter, the composition of which is exceedingly poor, a fact emphasized also by

the author himself (pp. 39–40), we can nevertheless assume that such a lay did exist. On the other hand, it does not seem to me that the author is correct in his characterization of the original poem (p. 44). I cannot refrain from stressing the great uncertainty, nay the uselessness, of attempting to pass judgment on a supposed poem based on an imperfect, and as the author believes interpolated, prose account. There is absolutely nothing that argues against accepting that the poem is from the twelfth or even the eleventh century. I do not see that there is any marked difference between these dreams and others as Heusler argues.

Finally as regards the remainder, Chapters 26–29, they are as Heusler says, all closely related with regard to contents. After having cited (v.) the various earlier opinions as to how many poems, these chapters are based on the author says that the last *i. e.* the view that I have held and expressed, namely that there was only one poem, is the more probable. But he adds, that the possibility should be considered as to whether there may not have been two poems, that have been combined in the prose. This is of course not impossible. His investigation here is very ingenious, though he seems at times to be straining the point somewhat. He comes to the conclusion, that there must have been two poems, *Sigurðarkviða en forna* and *Sigurðarkviða en meiri*, very different in style and age. I have assumed one poem (*Sigkv. en meiri*) which must have been a very long one, indeed the longest among the lays of the Edda, since it was this that caused that the so-called third Sigurd lay, which, as we know, contains over 70 strophes, was by contrast called “the short” (*en skamma*). I have believed it necessary to assume this, partly on account of the above mentioned close connection of parts in the saga and, in part, because the strophes cited in Chapters 27, 28, 29 are all the same formally and uniform with the Sigurd lay fragment. I must therefore hold to my view, that we need only assume one poem, *Sigurðarkviða en meiri*; but we need not assume that it had more than c. 150 strophes; the lay relating the dreams may have contained c. 50 strophes and the remainder of the 16 pages of the lacuna may have been taken up by prose parts; with these we must also reckon; nor is it known precisely how much of the *Sigrdrífumál* is missing, and finally there may have been a poem not known or used by the author of the *Völsungasaga*.

Nor can I here either agree with Heusler that on account of the character of the prose there were two poems different in style. It would lead too far to enter upon all points discussed by the author,

the reader must be referred to the work itself. On the whole I must say that with all the author's acuteness at reasoning and all due praise to his method, it seems to me entirely too risky an undertaking to aim to distinguish so unreservedly between separate poems, the spirit of their various authors, etc., and the time of origin of each—and all mainly on the basis of the account in the *Völsungasaga*. Suppose this could be done with Chapters 33–34 where *Atlakviða* and *Atlamál* are combined into two chapters. If some acute scholar who did not before know these poems could make the attempt, but it would be difficult to find a man with Professor Heusler's qualifications.

Finally I may call the reader's attention especially to § 2, which I have not spoken of before. This chapter does not deal with the lacuna in the narrower sense, but discusses the much disputed and interesting question as to how far *Sigrdríf* (when will one cease using the incorrect and late form *Sigrdrífa*?) is identical with Brynhild. I have elsewhere expressed my opinion on this matter; I maintain still that *Sigrdríf* (against Symons) is a proper name, not an appellative, but emphasize (with Symons' views as lately developed) that the two were identical for the poets of the 10th century, and then of course also for all later poets. Nevertheless I have no hesitancy in accepting Professor Heusler's position when, after a long investigation, the details of which I cannot here enter upon, he arrives at the result (p. 23) that the two "von hause aus" were distinct. But the time when the two poems were individually independent lies far back of the 10th century.

There is no reason to dwell on details. Permit me to say, however, that *ástráð þín, Sigrdr.* 21 cannot possibly mean "der Besitz deiner Liebe" (p. 7) as the author translates, though hesitatingly.

In closing I wish to thank Professor Heusler for this highly important and excellent treatise, although I can only in part subscribe to his conclusions, and I urge all who are interested in the old heroic lays to read this instructive work.

FINNUR JÓNSSON.

COPENHAGEN.  
June, 1903.

---